UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

+ + + + +

OCS ALTERNATIVE ENERGY AND ALTERNATE USE
PROGRAMMATIC EIS
ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY
PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

+ + + + +

Tuesday, May 1, 2007

Sam Houston I Room Airport Marriott Hotel 18700 John F. Kennedy Boulevard Houston, Texas

The above-entitled meeting was conducted at 7:00 p.m., pursuant to notice, before: JOHN GASPER, Facilitator, Argonne National Laboratory.

## PANEL MEMBERS:

MAUREEN BORNHOLDT, Chief, Minerals Branch, MMS MARY BOATMAN, Environmental Assessment, MMS

MARK ROUSE, MMS

## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

WAYNE KROUSE, CEO, Hydro Green Energy

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

7:15 p.m.

MR. GASPER: Okay. Tonight there's several ways to comment -- two ways, actually. You can comment either in writing or you can comment orally. If you're -- if you'd like to comment in writing, we have some comment forms available out at the registration desk; you can either fill those out and hand them in tonight to any one of us who has a name tag, and we'll make sure they get into the public record, or you can go ahead and mail those in to us. And I guess the third way is to visit that website, and you can comment right through the website.

And as far as actually commenting orally tonight, we ask, if you haven't already, if you want to make a comment, please sign up at the registration desk. And then we'll us that sign-up list there to determine who goes first; it'll be first-come first-served. We ask that when your name is called you step up to the podium and do use the microphone. It's important that we get your entire comment.

In fact, we've got a court report here who's recording the whole comment period. So if you'll be so kind as to use the microphone so that she can hear, we'd appreciate that.

Please state your name and affiliation if you have one, and initially try to keep your comments to about three minutes so that we can accommodate the huge crowd that's here tonight -- no. Seriously, feel free to speak your mind tonight. We've got plenty of time, and -- but we are interested in hearing comments that you have about the programmatic EIS itself. So if you could focus your comments in that area, we'd appreciate that.

If you have any written materials or published materials or anything else you'd like to leave with us, feel free to do that. If -- and, again, anybody with a name tag you can leave that information with.

So at this time, we'll go to the registered speaker list. The first speaker is Wayne Krouse from Hydro Green Energy.

MR. KROUSE: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. My name's Wayne Krouse; I'm the chairman and CEO and inventor for Hydro Green Energy. We're an ocean current technology firm headquartered here in Houston, Texas. And consequently, we are also members of the National Hydropower Association and members of the Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition. And I am the current chairman of the research and

development committee for the National Hydropower Association.

My company is developing ocean current technologies, although, with the past experience of the regulatory uncertainty between FERC and MMS, we had elected to essentially begin deploying our units in rivers because it's a much more well-understood process. And even to this date, we are still moving along in that process with multiple projects, in Washington state and Texas and Minnesota, Mississippi and New York.

And one of the primary reasons we've elected to stay is because of the level of uncertainty determining what requirements would be needed from an environmental impact assessment or impact statement for our projects. So Hydro Green Energy believes that it's very important with respect to this hearing to make sure that there are not overlapping requirements or overlapping regulatory authorities between FERC and MMS.

If at some point a system is put into place that would require start-up companies or new technology companies that are trying to develop and commercialize their technologies which have the potential for tremendous benefits for the country,

both in terms of energy independence and on-carbonemitting energy sources, it would be very disadvantageous to have a duplicative system that required a large degree of expenditures or expenses to be put onto a young company to tackle those types of issues.

We are in favor of a programmatic EIS, primarily because we feel it has a lot of advantages. We don't advocate necessarily a case-by-case situation, because of the ability to have certain issues that may apply from one case to the other to selectively not be applied. And we also believe that for any projects that are currently, I guess, inside of the FERC process looking for preliminary permits, this does not hold up -- the programmatic EIS does not hold up any of those projects from going forward.

And then lastly, we also advocate in situ studies for marine life impacts and environmental impacts, as opposed to doing laboratory analyses or laboratory studies. As a chemical engineer by degree and, also, a research assistant in college, it has always been my belief that the best data is gathered in real-world scenarios and real-world situations and, therefore, what you actually get in laboratories are not necessarily representative of what you would see

1 out there. 2 So, you know, we would want to have this 3 occur in any types of studies that go along with the 4 EIS, if it were to impact individual projects, to be 5 done in situ, as opposed to before hand. And that concludes my comments. 6 7 MR. GASPER: Thank you. 8 We have no other registered speakers. 9 there anybody else who'd like to make a comment 10 tonight? 11 (Pause.) 12 Is there anybody who has a MR. GASPER: 13 question to the MMS staff who are here tonight? 14 MR. KROUSE: Any updates on the MOU 15 between FERC and MMS? 16 MS. BORNHOLDT: Му name is 17 Bornholdt, and I'm the program manager for the 18 alternative energy and alternate use program, and I am 19 working with FERC on this MOA. In fact, we're waiting 20 to receive -- we're exchanging drafts, and, I guess, 21 we were probably in our fourth meeting with them when 22 we returned back to Washington. And it's going quite 23 well. 24 MR. KROUSE: Okay. One more question. 25 MS. BORNHOLDT: Sure.

1	MR. KROUSE: Just ball-park, any idea,
2	around time lines when there may be an estimated
3	resolution or a final agreement in terms of
4	implementing a frame work for regulatory who has
5	regulatory authority at the different in the
6	different aspects of the alternative energy
7	development offshore?
8	MS. BORNHOLDT: For the new
9	responsibilities that we received under Section 388,
10	our target is to come out with our proposed rule
11	making at the end of the summer. So we our plan is
12	to have whatever agreement we have with FERC done
13	before that time.
14	MR. KROUSE: Okay. Thank you.
15	MR. GASPER: Any other questions or
16	comments?
17	(No response.)
18	MR. GASPER: Okay. If not, I'd like to
19	thank you all for coming, and we'll declare the
20	meeting closed. Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, at 7:25 p.m., this meeting was
22	concluded.)
23	
24	
2 5	